

## **REMARKS**

Please reconsider the application in view of the above amendments and the following remarks.

### **Disposition of Claims**

Claims 1-3, 6-9, 11, and 13-28 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 7, 9, 14, 17, 20, 27, and 28 are independent. The remaining claims depend directly or indirectly from claims 1, 7, 9, 14, and 17.

### **Previously Filed Communications**

Application respectfully notes that the Examiner did not indicate which previously filed communication the present Office Action was in response to on page 1 of the Office Action. However, for purposes of responding to this Action, Applicant is treating this action as responsive to communications filed on June 23, 2004.

### **Objections**

Claim 6 is objected to by the Examiner for impermissible dependence. Claim 6 has been amended to depend from independent claim 1 to clarify the present invention recited. Accordingly, withdrawal of this object is respectfully requested.

### **Rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C § 103**

Claims 1-3, 6-9, 11, and 13-28 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over U.S. Patent 6,233,622 ("Atsatt") in view of U.S. Patent 6,757,900 ("Burd"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

To establish a prima facie case of obviousness, three basic criteria must be met. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. The teaching or suggestion to make the claimed combination and the reasonable expectation of success must both be found in the prior art, and not based on applicant's disclosure. See MPEP section 706.02(j).

The initial burden is on the Examiner to provide some suggestion of the desirability of doing what the inventor has done. "To support the conclusion that the claimed invention is directed to obvious subject matter, either the references must expressly or impliedly suggest the claimed invention or the examiner must present a convincing line of reasoning as to why the artisan would have found the claimed invention to have been obvious in light of the teachings of the references." *Ex parte Clapp*, 227 USPQ 972, 973 (Bd. Pat. App. & Inter. 1985) as cited by MPEP section 706.02(j). When the motivation to combine the teachings of the references is not immediately apparent, it is the duty of the examiner to explain why the combination of the teachings is proper.

With respect to claim 1, the Examiner admits that Atsatt does not teach or suggest a properties object including a data dictionary, where the data dictionary comprises an attribute-value pair. However, the Examiner asserts that Burd discloses such a properties object. Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner's assertion. Specifically, Burd relates to managing the states of server-side control objects. Specifically, Burd

teaches server-side control objects corresponding to individual user interface elements of a web page and are created on the web server to process and generate the web page content to be used by a client-side browser.

Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner that the Limited Object Serialization (LOS) format, which specifies a hash table of name/value pairs (*see* Burd, col. 20, ll. 15-21), equates to a properties object that includes the data dictionary. The LOS of Burd is a hierarchical structure in which the hierarchy is specified using nested hash tables (*Burd*, col. 21, ll. 50-55). Specifically, Burd discloses that the name/value pairs are hash entries in the hash table, where each hash entry contains state information for a property of the control object or a nested hash table of a child control object (*see* Burd, col 20. ll 18-22). However, Burd does not teach that the attribute-value pair contains necessary attributes of objects that are used by handler object(s) when answering client requests, as alluded to by the Examiner. Also, Burd does not disclose or suggest that the LOS is used by handler objects to answer client requests.

Further, Burd does not teach a properties object containing information used by the various components of the Web application. Specifically, Burd does not teach a web application designed to modularly process a request such that the request is passed through a series of handler objects (*i.e.*, server object, handler object, request object), where each object performs a simple task and then forwards the request to the next module. As a result, Burd does not disclose a modular approach to processing a request.

In view of the above, Atsatt and Burd, whether viewed separately or in combination, do not support the rejection. The rejection of dependent claims is not supported by these references for at least the same reasons. Further, the rejection of

independent claims 7, 9, 14, and 17, and associated dependent claims is also not supported by Atsatt and Burd. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested with respect to claims 1, 7, 9, 14, 17, and claims depending therefrom.

With respect to claims 27 and 28, the Examiner asserts that Atsatt recites a method and framework, respectively, for processing a web request from a web application. The Applicant respectfully asserts that neither Atsatt nor Burd, whether viewed separately or in combination, support the rejection of claims 27 and 28. The Examiner admits that Atsatt does not disclose or suggest processing the request where each of the plurality of interior handler objects processes a portion of the request to obtain a partial result (see, *e.g.*, specification pages 21-22). Further, Burd does not teach what Atsatt lacks. Burd discloses that control objects cooperate to process the request received from the client (see, *e.g.*, col. 4, ll. 56-60), but Burd fails to disclose or suggest that control objects processing the request produce *partial results* that are stored in the *properties object*. Further, Burd discloses a plurality of handlers for handling different types of resources; however, Burd does not disclose that the plurality of handlers service *portions of the resources to produce partial results*. As noted above, Burd does not disclose a properties object as defined in the present invention. Thus, it is impossible for Burd to disclose that a partial result obtained by a handler object is stored in the properties object.


Thus, in view of the above, it is clear that neither Atsatt nor Burd, whether viewed separately or in combination, support the rejection of claims 27 and 28. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested with respect to claims 27 and 28.

**Conclusion**

Applicant believes this reply is fully responsive to all outstanding issues and places this application in condition for allowance. If this belief is incorrect, or other issues arise, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned or his associates at the telephone number listed below. Please apply any charges not covered, or any credits, to Deposit Account 50-0591 (Reference Number 16159.142001).

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 11/8/04

 \$45,079  
Jonathan P. Osha, Reg. No. 33,986  
OSHA & MAY L.L.P.  
One Houston Center, Suite 2800  
1221 McKinney Street  
Houston, TX 77010  
Telephone: (713) 228-8600  
Facsimile: (713) 228-8778

77013\_2